

are trying to achieve. We are trying to achieve high quality so we get the results that Head Start gets and most other States don't get.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The gentleman from California?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's passion on this, but his testimony bears little resemblance to reality. I would urge him to read the amendment which states clearly on page 11, "Head Start services furnished in a State program under this section shall include all Head Start services."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. I have a tremendous amount of respect for the chairman of the committee, Mr. MILLER, but I disagree with him on his basic premise here.

I do believe that the Governors of this country, which I had the chance to be one, seems eons ago now, but a few years ago, have a tremendous and strong interest in the children of their States and in the education of those children.

I also believe that in the time since Head Start was created, that many of these Governors have put together pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, early childhood programs. I think they are ready to move forward with this. I think in many instances they have been competitive with, if not even ahead of, Head Start. We basically backed off from what the White House proposed originally, which is to give all 50 States the option to do this, to a pilot program of eight States.

There are requirements that those eight States match these funds, in fact, put in extra money in order to be able to enter into this program of dealing with the Head Start-type programs. The State demo would be limited to States with a demonstrated investment in early childhood education and established existing preschool system.

You can't just jump into this and take the money or whatever. You have to show you are ready for it, and that you are ready to do it, and you are ready to put the money into it. I believe strongly that those States should be afforded the opportunity. I actually think the competition with some of the Head Start providers would be positive in terms of developing the opportunity for young children.

I would hope that everybody would stop for a moment and take time for a

moment to listen to this amendment and the arguments pro and con before votes are cast on it. I believe Mr. PRICE has demonstrated through Georgia, as well as other States, that this is something which could be beneficial to the children, which is really what this is all about, hopefully helping those children in poverty so that they could move ahead.

I hope everybody will support the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would just say in reading the amendment that States should generally follow the standards. I served in a State legislature for 12 years in appropriations, and I know what license that word "generally" gives to a State legislature in a State government. Generally it does not keep these really good high standards that we have worked on for 42 years on in this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that is exactly the point. Yes, it offers all services, but it doesn't require the same high-quality service we have now. You can do all of these things, but you end up doing these things on the cheap because the demand is for slots. We have seen that tension here all the time.

There are no requirements here that you have anything comparable to the quality and the requirements in the Head Start program, and yet you are you are taking money out of the program to give it for these other purposes.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, before I came to Washington, I served in local government on the school board, on the city council. I have great respect for local leadership. I don't know what we're afraid of.

Sometimes I get the feeling that people here in Washington feel that all wisdom resides within the Beltway. I just think that to give the opportunity to a maximum of eight States to try to expand and bring creativity to a program that's good, to make it better, I think is nothing but a good thing, and it's on the upside.

I commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for this amendment. I encourage all to support it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the perspective of the other side, but I would suggest, respectfully, that that's an old argument. It's an old argument about a block grant. This is not a block grant. This is a demonstration program that

would allow States to serve more children, not fewer children, more, more than is currently possible than just with Head Start or with State-run early childhood development programs.

Economies of scale, it works. Funding levels for Head Start and early childhood services would be protected. Demonstration program States will be able to eliminate overlap, eliminate duplication of services, and participants must have access to services that are as extensive or greater than those found in Head Start. That's what the amendment states.

I urge my colleagues to read the amendment. I appreciate the fact that they have had previous amendments in legislation before them, but I urge them to read this amendment. I think they will find the common-sense aspect of it.

I appreciate the opportunity to offer it, and I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SESTAK

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-116.

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. SESTAK:

Page 159, after line 12, insert the following (and make such technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate):

“(g) INCENTIVES FOR HEAD START TEACHERS AND EARLY HEAD START TEACHERS.—

“(1) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subsection to encourage individuals to begin and continue teaching in Head Start programs and Early Head Start programs.

“(2) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—From the sums appropriated pursuant to paragraph (9), the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized carry out a program to forgive, in accordance with this subsection, the student loan debt of any borrower who has one or more loans described under subparagraph (B) made on or after October 1, 1998, and who—

“(i) commits to working as a Head Start teacher or an Early Head Start teacher for at least 3 consecutive complete program years;

“(ii) has a bachelor's degree in a field related to early childhood education; and

“(iii) is not in default on a loan for which the borrower seeks forgiveness.

“(B) METHOD OF LOAN FORGIVENESS.—To provide the loan forgiveness authorized in subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of